

KEVIN RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

ELIZABETH C. McBRIDE
Law Clerk

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-6488
Fax: (415) 436-7234
Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATT TEITELBAUM,

Defendant.

CR No.: 06-00175 MAG

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

On July 24, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from July 24, 2006 to September 13, 2006 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate time to supply the United States with information that may impact the outcome of the case and that the United States required adequate time to evaluate the information. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for continuity of defense counsel and effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of

1 due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of
2 justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the
3 defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

4 SO STIPULATED:

5 KEVIN V. RYAN
6 United States Attorney

7 DATED: 7/24/06

8 /s/
ELIZABETH C. McBRIDE
Law Clerk


9 DATED: 7/25/06

10 /s/
RONALD C. TYLER
11 Attorney for Mr. Teitelbaum

12 As the Court found on July 24, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that
13 the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the
14 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act
15 calculations from July 24, 2006 to September 13, 2006 for effective preparation of defense
16 counsel and the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the
17 requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation
18 and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
19 miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

20
21 SO ORDERED.

22 DATED: August 1, 2006

23 
EDWARD M. CHEN
United States Magistrate Judge